

**REMARKS**

In the Official Action the Examiner rejects all the claims pending in this application as allegedly being anticipated by Mitchell, U.S. Patent No. 5,305,180.

As the Examiner will note by reference to claim amendments made above, the independent claims pending in this application have been amended to more clearly differentiate themselves from Mitchell.

However, before discussing the claim amendments, the applicant points out that the introductory portions of the specification have been amended to use the term "spring support" as opposed to "sprung" support to use better idiomatic English. Of course, the Examiner read the word "sprung" in the specification as "spring" given the fact that the Examiner read the limitation "sprung" upon element 97 of Mitchell which is a spring. The Examiner will also note that the claims have also been amended to use consistent terminology.

Turning now to the amendments made to claim 1, the essence of claim 2 has been brought over to claim 1 and, more specifically, the recited at least one post is now indicated as being "fixedly attached to at least one spring member associated with that component support". In Mitchell, the Examiner reads the recited spring support on element 97 and the recited at least one post on element 95. Claim 1, as amended, recites that the at least one post is fixedly attached to at least one spring member.

Additionally, claim 1 recites a "post moving device operable to engage and disengage a raised dome portion of at least one spring member to thereby move and retain the at least one post in the selected one of said component engaging position and component nonengaging position". The Examiner reads Mitchell's element 41 on the recited "post moving device", of course, Mitchell's element 41 is not "operable to engage and disengage a raised dome portion of the at least one spring member" as claimed in claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Mitchell.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the at least one post is "fixedly attached to said at least

one spring member” and to recited that the post moving device is “operable to engage and disengage to at least one spring member”. Additionally, claim 7 recites that the at least one spring member is “secured to the casing”.

It is believed that claim 7, as amended, also clearly distinguishes itself from Mitchell.

\*\*\*

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with  
the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first  
class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment,  
Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-  
1450 on

February 16, 2006

(Date of Deposit)

Shannon Tinsley



(Signature)

2/16/06

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 43,010

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300